PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY WRITTEN OPINION OF THE see form PCT/ISA/220 INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION see form PCT/ISA/220 See paragraph 2 below Priority date (day/month/year) International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) PCT/B2004/000533 19.02.2004 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC B02C17/14 Applicant GOMEZ SANCHEZ, Felix Arturo This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion ☑ Box No. II Priority Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability ☐ Box No. III ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application **FURTHER ACTION** If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Authorized Officer

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Redelsperger, C

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-6058



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

ID/551881 International application No. PCT/IB2004/000533

JC20 Rec'd PETIPTO 30 SEP 2009

	Box I	o. I Basis of the opinion		
1.	With i	egard to the language , this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in guage in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.		
	la	nis opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following nguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search nder Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).		
2.	With	egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and sary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:		
	a. typ	e of material:		
		a sequence listing		
		table(s) related to the sequence listing		
	b. format of material:			
	· 🗀	in written format		
		in computer readable form		
	c. tim	e of filing/furnishing:		
		contained in the international application as filed.		
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.		
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.		
3.	1	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto as been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional opies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as oppropriate, were furnished.		
4.	Addit	onal comments:		

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2004/000533

Во	x No. II	Priority							
. 🖾	The fol	llowing document ha	s not beei	n furnished	l:				
	\boxtimes	copy of the earlier a	application	n whose pri	ority has been	claimed (Rul	e 43 <i>bis</i> .1 an	d 66.7(a)).	
		translation of the ea	arlier appli	ication who	se priority has	been claimed	d (Rule 43 <i>bis</i>	s.1 and 66.	7(b)).
	Conse neverti	quently it has not be heless been establis	en possib hed on the	le to consid e assumpti	der the validity on that the rel	of the priority evant date is t	claim. This the claimed p	opinion ha	s e.
2. 🗆	has be	pinion has been esta en found invalid (Ru ate indicated above	les 43bis.	1 and 64.1). Thus for the	purposes of t	the fact that this opinion,	t the priorit the interna	y clain tional
. Ad	ditional	observations, if nece	ssary:		•				
	x No. V		ment und	er Rule 43	bis.1(a)(i) wit	h regard to n	ovelty, inve	entive step	or
inc	dustrial	Reasoned stater applicability; citation	ment und ons and e	er Rule 43 explanation	<i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) wit ns supporting	h regard to n g such staten	ovelty, invenent	entive step	or
inc		applicability; citation	ons and e	er Rule 43 explanation Claims Claims	bis.1(a)(i) with the supporting 1-50	h regard to n g such staten	ovelty, invenent	entive step	or
inc I. Sta No	dustrial atement	applicability; citation	ons and e	Claims Claims	ns supporting	h regard to n g such staten	ovelty, invenent	entive step	or
inc I. Sta No Inv	dustrial atement ovelty (No	applicability; citation	Yes: No: Yes:	Claims Claims Claims Claims	ns supporting	h regard to n g such staten	ovelty, invenent	entive step	or
No Inv	dustrial atement ovelty (Note of the continue	applicability; citation	Yes: No: Yes: No: Yes:	Claims Claims Claims Claims Claims Claims Claims	1-50 1-50	h regard to n g such staten	ovelty, inve	entive step	or
Inc No Inc Inc	atement ovelty (Noventive solustrial attacks)	applicability; citation) tep (IS) applicability (IA)	Yes: No: Yes: No: Yes:	Claims Claims Claims Claims Claims Claims Claims	1-50 1-50	h regard to n g such staten	ovelty, inve	entive step	or
Inc I. Sta No Inc Inc	atement ovelty (Noventive solustrial attacks)	applicability; citation tep (IS) applicability (IA) and explanations	Yes: No: Yes: No: Yes:	Claims Claims Claims Claims Claims Claims Claims	1-50 1-50	h regard to n g such staten	ovelty, inve	entive step	or

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/000533

JC20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 3 0 SEP 2005

Re. Item V

1. Claim 1

1.1. Closest Prior Art

Document D1: PATENT ABSTRACTS OF JAPAN vol. 2003, no. 12, 5 December 2003 (2003-12-05) & JP 2003 220344 A (NICHIA CHEM IND LTD), 5 August 2003 (2003-08-05); which describes also a vertical symmetrical vibrating mill, is considered to represent the closest available prior art.

1.2. Difference

The subject-matter of claim 1 differs from that of D1, in that an amount of power proportional to a distance between the exciter element and the reference plane of symmetry is provided on the exciter elements of the vibrating mill of claim 1.

1.3. Objective problem

Providing a vertical vibrating mill which operates in a satisfactorily efficient manner.

Since none of the available prior art documents discloses such a vibrating mill, the subject-matter of claim 1 can be considered both, as novel and inventive (Art.33(1)-(3) PCT).

1.4. Industrial application

The industrial application is obvious (Art.33(1) and (4) PCT).

2. Claim 45

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/IB2004/000533

Claim 45 describes a method for grinding a substance by using the mill described in claim 1.

For similar reasons as those given for claim 1, the subject-matter of claim 23 can be considered as novel, inventive and industrially applicable in the sense of Article 33 (1)-(4) PCT.

Re. Item VII

Independent claims 1 and 45 are not in the two-part form in accordance with Rule 6.3(b) PCT, which in the present case would be appropriate, with those features known in combination from the prior art (document D1) being placed in the preamble (Rule 6.3(b)(l) PCT) and with the remaining features being included in the characterising part (Rule 6.3(b)(ii) PCT).

The features of the claims should be provided with reference signs placed in parentheses to increase their intelligibility (Rule 6.2(b) PCT). This applies to both the preamble and characterising portion.